REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claim 1, 3-6, 8, 9, and 12 have been amended. Claim 2, 7, and 13 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, and 14-17 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS AND CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The claims are amended herewith in most cases according to the Examiner's suggestions. However, relative to the objection directed to "indicating a user" in claim 3 line 4, the term "user" has no antecedent basis; the claim previously recites "a user information storage section" and "user data" but not simply "a user." Relative to the objection directed to "store unique data" in claim 4 line 2, the term "unique data" has no antecedent basis in independent claim 4. Also, claim 8 line 3 was not amended to recite "a unique data" as suggested in the Office Action because "data" is a plural noun (while "unique" is only an adjective).

In view of the claim amendments and the above explanations, Applicants respectfully request the objection to be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 6 and 8 clarify the claimed subject matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Supreme Court has identified three categories of subject matter that are unpatentable, namely "laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185. 35 U.S.C. §101 identifies "process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter" as being statutory subject matter. According to the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility (hereinafter "IG101"), the "Useful, Concrete, Tangible Result" ("UCTR") test is applied only if the claims are originally directed to a non-statutory subject matter but a "practical application of an abstract idea" (see page 28 in IG101).

Claims 1, 3 and 10 are directed to "an authorization device" which is a statutory subject matter as "machine". Thus, applying the UCTR test to claims 1, 3 and 10 is improper.

Claim 4 is directed to "a computer" which is a statutory subject matter as "machine". Thus, applying the UCTR test to claim 4 is improper.

Claim 5 is directed to "a communication system" which is a statutory subject matter as "machine". Thus, applying the UCTR test to claim 5 is improper.

Claims 6, 8, and 9 are directed to "a computer-readable medium storing a program" which is a statutory subject matter as "manufacture". Thus, applying the UCTR test to claims 6 and 8 is improper.

Claim 11 is directed to "an authorization method" which is a statutory subject matter as "process". Thus, applying the UCTR test to claim 11 is improper. Claim 13 is cancelled herewith.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §101 to be withdrawn because the claims are directed to statutory subject matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029336 to Sekiyama et al. ("Sekiyama").

Sekiyama discloses an information processing center that correlates and stores a communication terminal ID assigned uniquely to each communication terminal used by a user and a user ID assigned uniquely to each user attempting to access, and stores user information correlated with the user ID. The user is then identified based on the communication terminal ID received by the information processing center. (See Abstract of Sekiyama.)

Applicants believe claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least because Sekiyama does not teach or suggest "a communication determining section to determine whether a particular communication with said computers is possible or not, depending on said information of the computers." Claim 12 depending from claim 1 is also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from claim 1.

Claim 3 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting" a user information storage section to store unique user data indicating a user who can use one of said computers corresponding to said each unique data, and a password related to each of the unique user data" and "an authorizing section to authorize the user on the basis of said unique data received by said unique data receiving section, said unique user data and the password stored in said user information storage section."

Claim 4 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting "an external reference storage region which can be referenced by external computers, which is an area where a cookie information is stored."

Claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the Sekiyama at least because Sekiyama fails to disclose the structure as recited in claim 5, that is: (1) "a unique data storage section" and (2) "a unique data transmitting section" included in clients, and (1') "a client information storage section", (2') "a unique data receiving section" and (3') "a client searching section" included in the server, as recited in claim 5.

Claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting "determining whether a particular communication between the computer and said external computer is possible or not, depending on said searched information of said external computer."

Claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting "authorizing a user on the basis of said received unique data, unique user data stored in a user information storage section, indicating whether the user can use said external computer corresponding to each unique data, and a password stored in the user information storage section related to each of the unique data."

Claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting "copying said unique data to an external reference storage region which is an area where cookie information is stored, and which can be referenced from external computers."

Claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Sekiyama at least by reciting "determining whether the computer is able and authorized to perform a service."

NEW CLAIMS 14-17

New claims 14-17 are fully supported by the originally filed specification and claims.

Claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the prior art at least by reciting "a searching section that searches the storage section based on the unique data received by the data receiving section, and obtains the information related to the client, wherein the server determines whether the client is able to provide a particular service or not, and provides the particular service to the client if the client is able to provide the particular service." Claim 15 depending from claim 14 is patentable by inheriting patentable features from claim 14 and by reciting additional patentable features.

Claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting "a searching section that searches the information related to the client in the storage section based on the unique data received by the data receiving section, wherein the server determines whether the client is able to provide a particular service or not, and registers the client or a user using the client when it is determined that the client is able to provide the particular service."

Claim 17 depending from claim 5 patentable by inheriting patentable features from claim

14 and by reciting additional patentable features.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Aug 14, 2007

By: L Todor

Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501